CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH RESULTS

The twenty private hospitals approached represented approximately 70% of the total estimated private hospitals bed space available in Penisular Malaysia which has 6,000 beds per the MOH 1993 Annual Report. A total of twelve out of the twenty hospitals approached by the interviewers responded. Out of the eight who did not respond, one declined to participate and the remaining seven were late in responding. The twelve hospitals that responded represents a total of 2,622 bed space which is approximately 40% of the total private hospitals bed space available in Penisular Malaysia. The twelve hospital that responded provides eighty critical care beds and thirty eight operation theatres. This survey indicates that the percentage of critical care beds to total bed space is approximately 3%. The percentage of critical care beds in a private hospital may vary depending on the type of services provided in that hospital. A hospital that provides mainly open heart surgery such as the National Heart Centre will have a higher percentage of critical care beds compared to a general purpose hospital while a hospital providing mainly maternity services will have a lower percentage of critical care beds which sometimes may equal to none.

The private hospital surveyed revealed a total of thirty eight operation theatres. This is approximately 1.4% of total bed space. However, this percentage of operation theatres may not be generalised because the number of operation theatres is dependent on the number of specialists available and also on the nature of services provided.

For example, in the case of Pantai Puteri Hospital, the number of bed space is 250 beds but the actual number of critical care beds and operation theatres is still unknown as they

will be implemented in stages and also dependent on the number of specialists and demand for such services.

Out of the twelve purchasing managers interviewed, those from Penang requested for anonmity. However data from the two Penang hospital were presented as Penang A (127 beds) and Penang B (550 beds). Of the twelve private hospitals that responded, two were from Penang, four from Perak, five from Selangor and the remaining one was from Melaka. Four of the hospitals has 100 to 200 beds capacity, another five has 200 to 300 beds capacity while the last three has 300 to 500 beds capacity (Table 1).

Other particulars such as size in terms of paid up capital and ownership of hospitals, the respondents were reluctant to disclose.

TABLE 1:- Characteristics Of The Twelve Private Hospitals Interviewed

STATE	Bed Size	No. of Critical Care Beds	No. of Operation Theatres
A) **PENANG**			
1) Penang A	127	7	2
2) Penang B	550	10	4
B) **PERAK**			
3) Pantai Puteri Hospital	250	-	-
4) Perak Chinese maternity	100	0	4
5) Ipoh Specialist Center	200	6	4
6) Fatimah Hospital	200	4	3
C) **SELANGOR**			
7) Ampang Puteri Hospital	350	15	4
8) Pantai Medical Center	235	10	5
9) Assunta Hospital	350	8	4
10) Sentosa Medical Center	120	10	
11) Tawakal Hospital	140	5	3
			4

D) MELAKA 12) Southern Hospital	250	5	1
TOTAL	2.622	80	

The Role Of The Buying Centre In The Private Hospital Buying Decision

Gatekeepers

Table 2, represents the purchaser's opinion of gatekeeper's involvement in controlling the flow of information to the buying centre. 75% of the respondents were neutral, 12.5% agreed and the remaining 12.5 disagreed on this issue. It is infered from the results that the gatekeeper does not play a significant role in controlling the flow of information to the buying centre.

TABLE 2 :- Purchaser's Opinion Of Gatekeeper's Involvement In Controlling Flow Of Information To The Buying Center

VALUE	NO. OF HOSPITALS	PERCENTAGE
1	1	12.5
2	6	75.5
3	1	12.5
4	-	-
5	-	-
Missing cases	4	-
TOTAL	12	100

Mean score is 3.0, Standard deviation is 0.53

Note: Value of 1 is the least important while value of 5 is the most important.

Table 3 represents the purchaser's opinion of gatekeeper's influence on buying decision. Out of the total respondents , none agreed on this issue. 75% of the respondents were neutral and the other 25% disagreed. The results indicates that gatekeeper has no influence in the buying decision of private hospitals.

TABLE 3 :- Purchaser's Opinion of Gatekeeper's Influence On Buying Decision

VALUE	NO. OF HOSPITALS	PERCENTAGE
1	-	-
2	2	25.0
3	6	75.0
4	-	-
5	-	-
Missing cases	4	-
TOTAL	12	100

Mean score is 2.63, Standard Deviation is 0.74

Note: Value of 1 is the least important while value of 5 is the most important.

Users

There were 58.4% of the respondents who indicated that to a certain extent, users do initiate the buying decision, 16.6% remained neutral whilst 25% opined that users are involved in a limited extent in initiating the buying process. Hence, from the results, it can be assumed that users do initiate the buying process with 58.4 of the respondents agreeing (Table 4).

TABLE 4:- Users Initiate The Buying Process

VALUE		NO. OF HOSPITAL	VALID %
Limited extent	1	1	8.3
	2	2	16.7
	3	2	16.7
	4	5	41.7
Great extent	5	2	16.7
TOTAL		12	100

Note: The higher the value, the greater the extent of involvement it indicates.

There were 50% of the respondents who indicated that to a certain extent, users define purchase specifications, 41.7% were neutral and 8.3% reported that users were only involved in a limited extent in defining purchase specifications. The results indicates that users are involved in defining purchase specifications (Table 5).

TABLE 5:- Users Define Purchase Specifications

VALUE		NO. OF HOSPITAL	VALID %
Limited extent	1	1	8.3
	2	-	-
	3	5	41.7
	4	-	-
Great extent	5	6	50.0
TOTAL		12	100

Influencers

There were 75% of the respondents who agreed that head of departments influence private hospitals buying decision with a highest mean score of 3.75. This is followed by financial controllers with 50% of the respondents agreeing and a mean score of 3.75 and 58.3% of the respondents opined that medical superintendents are also influencers with a mean score of 3.08 (Table 6).

TABLE 6 :- Influencers In Private Hospital Buying Decision

Influencers	Mean	Std. Dev.	No.of Hospitals
1) HEAD OF DEPARTMENTS	3.75	1.06	12
2) FINANCIAL CONTROLLERS	3.50	0.80	12
3) MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT	3.08	1.44	12

4) PRIVATE HOSPITALS	2.75	1.54	12
5) TECHNICAL PERSONNEL	2.50	1.38	12
6) OPINION LEADERS	2.42	1.16	12
7) GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS	2.00	1.28	12

Buyers

In a straight rebuy, 51.7% of the respondents indicated that buyers are involved to a certain extent in shaping product specifications with a mean score of 3.29.

In a modified rebuy, 75.0% of the respondents indicated that buyers are involved to a certain extent in shaping product specifications with a mean score of 4.0.

For a new task, 85.7% of the respondents indicated that buyers are involved to a certain in shaping product specifications. The mean score for the new task is 4.0.

The above shows that fewer respondents indicated that buyers were involved in shaping product specifications in a straight rebuy as product specifications would have been set in a straight rebuy. More respondents agreed that buyers were involved to a certain extent in shaping product specifications in modified rebuy and new task as they are an important part of purchasing.

The report indicates that buyers are involved to a great extent in selecting suppliers in all three buying situations. There were 87.5% of respondent who indicated buyers involvement to a great extent in selecting suppliers in a straight rebuy with a mean score of 4.25. There were 85.7% of respondents who indicated buyers involvement in a great extent in selecting supplier in a modified rebuy and new task with mean score of 4.14 for both buying situations (Table 7).

TABLE 7: Buyers In Three Types Of Private Hospital Buying Decision By Mean Score

	Straight Rebuy		Modified Rebuy		New Task	
	Mean	Std.Dev	Mean	Std.Dev	Mean	Std.Dev
1) Buyers shape product specs.	3.29	1.11	4.00	0.76	4.00	0.58
2) Buyers select suppliers	4.25	0.71	4.14	0.69	4.14	0.69

Deciders

In a straight rebuy, there were 75% of respondents who indicated that to a certain extent, a committee makes the buying decision with a mean score of 4.0 while 66.6% of the respondents indicated that to a certain extent, head of departments makes the decision and having a mean score of 3.89. There were 66.7% of the respondents who indicated that to a certain extent, matron makes the buying decision with a mean score of 3.44. The buyers, technical personnels and ward sisters were involved only to a small extent in making buying decisions (Table 8(A).

TABLE 8(A):- Deciders In Private Hospital Buying Decision In A Straight Rebuy Situation

DECIDERS	MEAN	STD DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL.

1)Committee	4.0	1.07	8
2)Head Of Department	3.89	1.05	9
3)Matron	3.44	1.24	9
4)Medical Superintendent	3.11	1.54	9
5)Buyer	2.78	1.84	9
6)Technical Personnel	2.56	1.42	9
7)Ward Sister	2.33	0.87	9

In a modified rebuy, 100% of the respondents indieated that to a great extent, a committee is involved in making the buying decision with a mean score of 4.17. There were 71.5% of the respondents who indicated that the head of departments is involved to a certain extent in making buying decisions with a mean score of 4.0 whilst 85.7% of the respondents indicated that the matron is involved to a certain extent in making the buying decisions and having a mean score of 3.71. There were 57.2% of the respondents who indicated that the medical superintendent is involved in the buying decision with the mean score of 3.14 (Table 8(B).

TABLE 8(B):- Deciders In Private Hospital Buying Decision In A Modified Rebuy Situation

DECIDERS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL.
1)Committee	4.17	0.41	6

2)Head Of Department	4.00	0.82	7
3)Matron	3.71	1.25	7
4)Medical Superintendent	3.14	1.57	7
5)Ward Sister	2.71	0.95	7
6)Buyers	2.43	1.40	7
7)Technical Personnel	2.29	1.50	7

In a new task, 100% of the respondents indicated that a committee is involved to a great extent in making the buying decision with a mean score of 4.57 whilst 85.7% of the respondents indicated that the head of departments is involved to a great extent in the buying decision with a mean score of 4.14. There were 85.7% of the respondents who indicated that the matron is involved to a certain extent in the buying decision with a mean score of 3.71 and 57.2% of the respondents indicated that the medical superintendent is involved to a certain extent in the buying decision and having a mean score of 3.29 (Table 8(C).

TABLE 8(C):- Deciders In A Private Hospital Buying Decision In A New Task Situation.

DECIDERS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL.
1)Committee	4.57	0.53	7
2)Head Of Department	4.14	0.69	7

3)Matron	3.71	1.25	7
4)Medical Superintendent	3.29	1.70	7
5)Buyer	2.57	1.62	7
6)Technical Personnel	2.43	1.62	7
7)Ward Sister	2.14	1.07	7

The buyer, technical personnel. ward sister are involved only to a limited extent in the buying decision.

The results indicates that a modified rebuy and a new task situation, buying decision is mainly decided by a committee. The buying committee would probably consist of the head of department, matron. medical superintendent, buyer and even the financial controller.

In a straight rebuy situation, only 25% of the respondents indicated that a buying committee is involved in a buying decision. The reason could be due to the fact that a straight rebuy is a fairly routine activity and hence, decisions would normally be based on past buying patterns.

Factors That Influence Private Hospital Buying Decision

Environmental Factors

There were 100% of the respondents who reported that the level of demand in the private hospital is the most important factor in determining buying behaviour and a mean score of 4.44 is computed whilst 55.5% of the respondents indicated that unreliable supply is an important factor for a hospital to change supplier. A mean score of 3.67 is recorded. Another 55.6% of the respondents also indicated that poor customer service as an important factor for changing supplier.There were 44.4% of the respondents who indicated that special offers as a factor in influencing the buying decision (Table 9).

It was noted that the private hospital purchasing decision was totally dependent on the level of demand in the hospital. The other factors that influence buying behaviour is reliability of supply, customer service, special offers, price increase. Cheaper price of medical products and competing services from other private hospitals has no significant influence on the buying decision.

TABLE 9:- **Importance Of Environmental Factors In Influencing Private Hospital Buying Behaviour.**

FACTORS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL.
Demand	4.44	0.53	9
Reliable Supply	3.67	1.22	9
Customer Service	3.33	0.87	9
Special Offers	3.33	0.71	9
Price Increase	3.00	0.71	9
Cheaper	2.56	1.24	9
Competition	2.56	1.24	9

Note: Mean is calculated based on 9 hospitals with 3 missing values. Scale used, 1 = least important and 5 = most important. The higher the score, the more important the factor.

Organizational Factors

The organizational factors that influence private hospital buying behaviour are customer service, prompt delivery, product specifications, price, supplier, payment terms and order quantity in descending order (Table 10). Delivery terms is of least importance in influencing private hospital buying behaviour.

There were 87.5% of the respondents who indicated customer service and prompt delivery as the most important factors (mean scores of 4.31and 4.25 respectively). 75% indicated product specifications and price as the factors (mean scores of 4.13and 4.00 respectively), 62.5% indicated supplier (mean score of 3.75) and 50% indicated payment terms and order quantity (mean scores of 3.63 and 3.62 respectively). Only 12.5% of the respondents indicated delivery terms as a factor in influencing private hospital buying behaviour.

TABLE 10:- Importance Of Organizational Factors In Influencing Private Hospital Buying Behaviour As An Overall Opinion

FACTORS	MEAN	STD DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL
Customer Serv	4.31	0.74	8
Prompt Delivery	4.25	0.71	8
Product Spec.	4.13	0.83	8
Price	4.00	1.07	8
Supplier	3.75	1.04	8

Payment Terms	3.63	0.74	8
Order Quantity	3.62	0.74	8
Delivery Terms	2.75	0.89	8

Overall, there were more than 50% of respondents who indicated that payment terms, order quantity and delivery terms are of low importance in influencing private hospital buying behaviour.

In a straight rebuy situation, 90% of respondents indicated that prompt delivery as the most important factor in influencing private hospital buying behaviour (mean score of 4.5), followed by customer service at 80% and with a mean score of 4.5. There were 70% of respondents who indicated product specifications as an important factor (mean score of 3.9), 60% indicated supplier, price and payment terms (mean score of 3.8, 3.7 and 3.3 respectively), 40% indicated order quantity (mean score of 3.2) and only 22.2% of the respondents indicated delivery terms (mean score of 2.9) as a factor in influencing buying behaviour in a straight rebuy situation (Table 11).

TABLE 11:- Importance Of Organizational Factors In Influencing Private Hospital Buying Behaviour In A Straight Rebuy Situation

FACTORS	MEAN	STD DEV.	NO OF HOSPITAL
Customer Serv	4.5	0.85	10
Prompt Delivery	4.5	0.71	10
Product Spec	3.9	0.99	10
Supplier	3.8	0.79	10
Price	3.7	1.16	10
Payment Terms	3.3	0.95	10
Order Quantity	3.2	1.03	10
Delivery Terms	2.89	1.17	10

In a modified rebuy situation, 87.5% of the respondents indicated customer service and prompt delivery as the most important factor in influencing private hospital buying behaviour (mean score of 4.5 and 4.25 respectively). There were 62.5% of respondents who indicated product specifications, supplier and payment terms as an important factor (mean score of 4.0, 3.75 and 3.63 respectively), 50% indicated price (mean score 3.75), 37.5% indicated order quantity (mean score of 3.25) and only 25% indicated delivery terms (mean score 3.0) as a factor in influencing buying behaviour in a modified rebuy situation (Table 12).

TABLE 12:- **Importance Of Organizational Factors In Influencing Private Hospital Buying Behaviour In A Modified Rebuy Situation.**

FACTORS	MEAN	STD DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL
Customer Service	4.5	0.76	8
Prompt Delivery	4.25	0.71	8
Product Spec.	4.0	0.93	8
Supplier	3.75	1.04	8
Price	3.75	0.89	8
Payment Terms	3.63	0.52	8
Order Quantity	3.25	0.71	8
Delivery Terms	3.00	1.20	8

In a new task situation, there were 87.5% of the respondents who indicated that customer service and product specifications as the most important factor in influencing private hospital buying behaviour with a mean score of 4.38and 4.13 respectively, followed by 75% who indicated prompt delivery, price and payment terms as an important factor (mean score of 4.25, 4.13 and 3.75 respectively). There were 62.5% of the respondents who indicated supplier as a factor (mean score of 3.88), 50% indicated order quantity (mean score of 3.25) and only 12.5% indicated delivery terms as a factor in influencing private hospital buying behaviour (Table 13).

TABLE 13:- Importance Of Organizational Factors In Influencing Private Hospital Buying Behaviour In A NewTask Situation

FACTORS	MEAN	STD DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL
Customer Service	4.38	0.74	8
Prompt Delivery	4.25	0.89	8
Price	4.13	1.13	8
Product Spec.	4.13	0.99	8
Supplier	3.88	1.13	8
Payment Terms	3.75	0.89	8
Order Quantity	3.25	0.89	8
Delivery Terms	2.88	1.13	8

It appears that more factors were deemed importact in a new task situation as compared to a modified rebuy or straight rebuy situation. This could be due to the reason that in a new task situation, more research and information is required.

For example, in a new task situation, 75% of the respondent (mean score of 3.75) indicated payment terms as an important factor whilst only 60% (mean score of 3.3) and 62.5% (mean score of 3.63) were indicated for straight rebuy and modified rebuy situations respectively. There were 50% of the respondent (mean score of 3.25) who indicated order quantity as an important factor in a new task situation whilst only 40%

(mean score of 3.2) and 37.5% (mean score of 3.25) were recorded for straight rebuy and modified situations respectively.

Table 14 shows the product quality image of USA, UK, Europe, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, India, China, Thailand and Indonesia and the mean score for same are 9.1, 8.5,8.2, 7.7, 5.4, 4.7, 4.5, 4.5, 3.8 and 3.2 respectively. Medical products from USA, UK, Europe and Japan have the best product quality image in Malaysia.

TABLE 14:- Country Of Origin Product Quality Image By Mean Score

COUNTRY	MEAN	STD. DEV.
USA	9.10	0.88
UK	8.55	1.29
EUROPE	8.20	0.79
JAPAN	7.70	1.42
SINGAPORE	5.40	1.07
MALAYSIA	4.70	1.49
INDIA	4.50	1.35
CHINA	4.50	1.43
THAILAND	3.80	1.40
INDONESIA	3.20	1.48

Note: On a scale of 1-10, 1 = the least superior and 10 = the most superior.

The product quality image of products from USA, UK, Europe and Japan are above average with all respondents indicating a score of 6 to 10 on a 10-point Likart scale where 1 equals the least superior and 10 equals the most superior (Table 15). The product quality image of medical products from Singapore, Malaysia, India, China, Thailand and Indonesia were rather mixed. The percentage of respondents indication of the product quality image presented in a ratio of above average: average: below average were as follows:-

	Above Average	Average	Below Average
Singapore	40%	40%	20%
Malaysia	40%	30%	30%
India	10%	50%	40%
China	20%	30%	50%
Thailand	0%	50%	50%
Indonesia	10%	10%	80%

TABLE 15:- Country Of Origin Product Quality Image

COUNTRY	BELOW AVERAGE 1 to 4		AVERAGE 5		ABOVE AVERAGE 6 to 10	
	NO. OF HOSP.	%	NO. OF HOSP	%	NO. OF HOSP	%
USA	-	-	--	-	10	100
UK	-	-	-	-	11	100
EUROPE	-	-	-	-	10	100
JAPAN	1	10	-	-	9	90

SINGAPORE	2	20	4	40	4	40
MALAYSIA	3	30	3	30	6	40
INDIA	4	40	5	50	1	10
CHINA	5	50	3	30	2	20
THAILAND	5	50	5	50	-	-
INDONESIA	8	80	1	10	1	10

Note: On a scale of 1 to 10, 1 = the least superior and 10 = the most superior.

For the purpose of analysis, a score of 1 to 4 equals below average, 5 equals average and 6 to 10 equals above average. The four major medical products manufacturers represented in Malaysia namely Braun (German), Terumo (Japanese), Becton Dickinson (BD) (USA) and Baxter (USA), have an above average product quality image.the home country of the various manufacturers by these companies may not necessarily originate from the home country. For example, for various reasons, usually economics. Braun manufactures in Germany and also in Malaysia (Penang), Terumo manufactures in Japan, Belgium and USA, BD manufactures in Mexico and Singapore besides its home base in USA and Baxter has manufacturing plants in USA and Mexico.

The percentage of respondents who indicated above average product quality image were Braun (77.8%, mean score - 7.22), Terumo (80.0%, mean score - 7.0), BD (88.8%, mean score - 7.0) and baxter (77.8%, mean score - 6.78) (Table 17).

TABLE 16:- **Product Quality Image Of The Four Major Medical Product Manufacturers Represented in Malaysia**

MANUFACTURER	BELOW AVERAGE 1 to 4		AVERAGE 5		ABOVE AVERAGE 6 to 10	
	NO. OF HOSP.	%	NO. OF HOSP.	%	NO. OF HOSP.	%
BRAUN	-	-	2	22.2	7	77.8
TERUMO	1	10	1	10.0	8	80.0
BD	-	-	1	11.12	8	88.8
BAXTER	-	-	2	22.2	7	77.8

The home country of the four multinational companies coincide with the product quality image of the country of origin (Table 17).

TABLE 17:- **Product Quality Image Of The Four Major Medical Product Manufacturers Represented in Malaysia By Mean Score.**

MANUFACTURER	MEAN	STD. DEV.
BRAUN	7.22	1.56
TERUMO	7.0	1.83
BD	7.0	1.12
BAXTER	6.78	1.09

Note: On a scale of 1 to 10, 1 = the least superior and 10 = the most superior.

Table 18 shows that sponsorship, promotional brochures and advertisements in local health care publications have limited influence on private hospital buying decision. the mean score of brochure (3.09), advertisements (3.09) and sponsorship (2.91) lies in the region of 3 which is a neutral score for the Likert 5-point attitude scale.

TABLE 18:- **Marketing communications Influence On Private Hospital Buying Behaviour**

PROMOTIONAL TOOLS	MEAN	STD DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL
BROCHURE	3.18	0.98	11
ADVERT	3.09	1.04	11
SPONSORSHIP	2.91	1.38	11

Note: Missing value = 1.

There were 45.5% of respondents who agreed that promotional brochures and advertisements influence buying decision whilst 36.4% agreed that sponsorship influence the buying decision (Table 19).

TABLE 19:- Percentage Of Agreement On Marketing Communications That Influence Private Hospital Buying Decision

ATTITUDE SCORE	BROCHURE (%)	ADVERT (%)	SPONSORSHIP (%)
DISAGREE (1 - 2)	18.2	27.3	27.3
NEITHER (3)	36.4	27.3	36.4
AGREE (4 - 5)	45.5	45.5	36.4

Note: Missing value = 1.

Table 20 shows that sales personnel as a marketing communication tool influences private hospital buying decision. There were 80% of respondents who agreed that a patient sales personnel is preferable (mean score of 4.3), 80% agreed that direct visit by sales personnel were preferred to phone calls (mean score of 4.0), 60% of the respondents agreed that they would likely to purchase from a friend (mean score of 3.9), 70% agreed that more frequent calls by sales personnel would influence buying decision (mean score of 3.6) and 50% agreed that expatriates were superior to locals in their ability to influence buying decision (mean score of 3.2).

Other characteristics of sales personnel that influence buying decision were older sales personnel (mean = 3.1), aggresive (mean = 3.0), managerial position (mean = 2.7), male (mean = 2.6), female (mean = 2.6) and degree (mean = 2.4). It was noted that more than 50% of respondents either disagreed or were neutral in this instance.

TABLE 20: Sales Personnel Characteristics Which Influence Private Hospital Buying Decision

CHARACTERISTICS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL
PATIENCE	4.3	0.82	10
DIRECT VISIT	4.0	0.94	10
FRIEND	3.9	1.37	10
FREQ.OF CALL	3.6	1.07	10
EXPATRIATE	3.2	1.40	10
OLDER	3.1	1.29	10
AGGRESSIVE	3.0	1.25	10
MANAGER	2.7	0.48	10
MALE	2.6	0.84	10
FEMALE	2.6	1.07	10
DEGREE	2.4	1.07	10

Note: A scale of 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree.

There were 45.5% of respondents who agreed that performance of distributors influence buying decision whilst 54.5% were neutral. It was noted that no respondent disagreed. The mean score for distributors was 3.73. It can be infered from the results that distributors performance influence buying decision to a certain extent (Table 21).

The four distributors most highly rated in descending order were:-

- Summit
- Jebsen and Jensen
- F. E. Zuellig
- Waleta

TABLE 21:- **Distributors Rating In terms Of Overall Performance**

DISTRIBUTORS	MEAN	STD. DEV.	NO. OF HOSPITAL
SUMMIT	4.4	0.7	9
JEBSEN & JENSEN	4.3	0.8	10
F.E. ZUELLIG	4.1	0.9	9
WALETA	3.7	0.5	9
DIETHELM	3.2	0.7	9
SIME DARBY	3.0	0.8	9
REMEDI	3.0	1.1	6
PHARMA SCHMIDT	2.9	1.0	9
SCIENTIFIC GENERAL	2.7	0.5	7
SCIENTIFIC			

Note: On a scale of 1 to 5, the higher the score, the better is the performance.